

## PATENT

## REMARKS

Claims 1-127 are pending in the present application. Claim 112 is amended to correct a typographical error in the claim. Claims 9-18, 53, 56-65, 84-93, and 102-111 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the Office Action mailed August 22, 2005, the Examiner objected to the drawings since the reference characters 206 and 1016 were not mentioned in the specification. In response thereto, Applicants have amended the appropriate portions of the specification to include the descriptions. Applicants believe these changes add no new matter to the application and are fully supported by the original disclosure.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-8, 19, 23-28, 31-38, 41-46, 49-52, 54, 55, 66-69, 72-77, 80-83, 94, 95, 98-101, 112, 113, 116-121, and 124-127 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Puuskari (U.S. 6,728,208). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as set forth by the Examiner.

In the rejection, the Examiner alleges Puuskari teaches to establish a first PDP channel having an IP address, to establish a second PDP channel having the same IP address as the first PDP channel, and to differentiate the endpoints of the first PDP channel and the second PDP channel using a link characteristic. The Examiner then alleges that it would have been obvious to modify the concept of Puuskari to Point-to-Point Protocol links. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the Puuskari reference.

Puuskari discloses a method for controlling a Quality of Service (QoS) in a mobile communication system. As disclosed in col. 4, lines 13-24 of Puuskari, a dynamic packet-based quality of service (QoS) mechanism is provided within a "transmission tunnel" defined by a more static packet data protocol context (PDP context). Each data packet is arranged to carry at least one QoS parameter, and the scheduling and the policing of the transmission of the data packets is made in a packet by packet basis according to the QoS information in the packets, while, however, within the limits set by the PDP context. This concept enables to have any number of QoS profiles in use simultaneously, e.g. a dedicated QoS profile for each of several Internet user applications run in the mobile station for a IP address.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Puuskari fails to disclose to establish a second Point-to-Point Protocol link having the same IP address as a first Point-to-Point Protocol link and to differentiate the endpoints of the first Point-to-Point Protocol link and the second

## PATENT

Point-to-Point Protocol link using a link characteristic as is substantially claimed in the present application. Additionally, Puuskari fails to disclose to establish a Point-to-Point Protocol session for each grade of Radio Link Protocol service used by an application to create a set of Point Protocol sessions, where each Point-to-Point Protocol session belonging to the set has the same Internet Protocol address and to differentiate the endpoint of each Point-to-Point Protocol session in the set using a session link characteristic as is substantially claimed by the present application. Even if it were considered proper to modify Puuskari's invention to PPP links as alleged by the Examiner, such modification does not teach the above-noted deficiencies with regard to the Puuskari reference. Applicants cannot find anywhere within the Puuskari reference, and within col. 4, lines 13-24 (as referenced by the Examiner) to establish a second Point-to-Point Protocol link having the same IP address as a first Point-to-Point Protocol link and to differentiate the endpoints of the first Point-to-Point Protocol link and the second Point-to-Point Protocol link using a link characteristic as is substantially claimed in the present application, and to disclose to establish a Point-to-Point Protocol session for each grade of Radio Link Protocol service used by an application to create a set of Point Protocol sessions, where each Point-to-Point Protocol session belonging to the set has the same Internet Protocol address and to differentiate the endpoint of each Point-to-Point Protocol session in the set using a session link characteristic as is substantially claimed by the present application. Accordingly, because the Puuskari reference (as modified by the Examiner) fails to teach the deficiencies noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable thereover for at least the reasons presented above.

The Examiner further rejected claims 3, 21, 29, 39, 47, 70, 78, 96, 114, and 122 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Puuskari (U.S. 6,728,208) and further in view of Sen et al. (U.S. 6,765,909).

Applicants respectfully submit that these claims depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims. Because Sen et al. does not make up for any of the above-noted deficiencies with regard to Puuskari, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable thereover for at least the reasons presented above with regard to Puuskari.

The Examiner further rejected claims 4, 22, 30, 40, 48, 71, 79, 97, 115, and 123 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Puuskari (U.S. 6,728,208) and further in view of Chuah et al. (U.S. 6,400,722).

**PATENT**

Applicants respectfully submit that these claims depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims. Because Chuah et al. does not make up for any of the above-noted deficiencies with regard to Puuskari, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable thereover for at least the reasons presented above with regard to Puuskari.

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**


In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 22, 2006

By:

  
George J. Oehling, Reg. No. 40,471  
(858) 658-1761

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502